



ATTACHMENT A

REMARKS

The interview held with the Examiner On October 31, 2006, is gratefully acknowledged. The courtesy and cooperative spirit shown by the Examiner during the interview is appreciated. The interview centered around the rejection on prior art. During the interview, applicants' representative proposed combining claims 1 and 10 in order to expedite the prosecution. The Examiner approved this general approach but stated that he would like to see more "structure" in the claim tying the "automatic controlling of public transport vehicles" to the rest of the claim. As discussed below, this has been done in response to the guidance provided by the Examiner, and it is believed that claim 1, as amended, clearly defines over the cited prior art.

Turning to the Office Action, claims 1-9 and 1 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being "anticipated by" the Veil reference. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, as mentioned above, in order to expedite the prosecution, the subject matter of claim 10 has been incorporated into claim 1 and, in response to the request of the Examiner, "structure" has been recited which ties the subject matter of claim 1 into the remainder of the claim. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the computer system automatically controls the operation of a public transport vehicle and that at least one of (i) said processor and (ii) said at least one peripheral is located on the public transport vehicle or along a wayside for the public transport vehicle. Support for this limitation is found, for example, at page 6, line 27, page 10, lines 9-12 and page 11, lines 23-34. Further, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments made to claim 1 do not require further search or consideration given that the basic concept that is newly claimed in claim 1, i.e., the concept that the computer system automatically controls operation of a public transport vehicle, has already been recited in claim 10 and thus this concept has been previously searched.

Turning to the rejection of claim 10, the Examiner has relied on the Becker patent as making up the deficiencies of the Veil patent with respect to controlling operation of a public transport vehicle. The Becker patent relates to an automatic computer device with emergency power shutdown capabilities. Power is provided to "a small amount of

static RAM that is incorporated into the computing device." Software manages the static RAM and this software "knows exactly where all of the object store pages are located so that in the event of a power loss, the page locations are known and hence the pages can be used when power is restored."

As indicated above, Veil is essentially concerned with preventing hackers from hacking into electronic transactions and, in this regard, secure processing is carried out in the security co-processor and non-secure processing is carried out in the host computer.

It is respectfully submitted that the Veil and Beckert patents relate to very different fields and it simply would not be obvious to combine the two. In this regard, the Examiner argues that the combination is obvious because the Beckert "method of controlling the operation of vehicle would not only extend application of the extended security structure of Veil in the system for running automotive vehicle during receiving data from host computing devices, and this will also provide safeguards and help detect any fault that might cause an incident." It is respectfully submitted that this statement does not follow from anything actually disclosed in either of the two references, and, in this regard, there would be little or no concern about someone hacking into an automotive computing device. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination is necessarily the improper product of hindsight.

While claim 1 has been amended in order to expedite the prosecution, it is noted that claim 1, in its previous form, clearly defines over Veil. For example, claim 1 recites that the processor and the at least one peripheral both process all types of input data codes including any secure input data codes. This feature simply is not disclosed in the Veil reference and, in fact, is contrary to the teachings of Veil.

As has been repeatedly pointed out, and as the Examiner apparently admits, the method disclosed in the Veil reference provides for processing of secure sensitive data in a coprocessor and for processing non-secure or non-sensitive data in the host computer. In the "Response to Arguments" section, the Examiner contends that the cited "prior art clearly teaches system and method for where an interface interfaces a security coprocessor to a host computer." The mere fact that there is an interface between the coprocessor and the host computer does not change the basic teachings

of Veil, viz., that processing of secure data takes place in the coprocessor and processing of non-secure data takes place in the host computer. Further, it is respectfully submitted that the other statements in the Office Action in support of the Examiner's position (i.e., that the "interface includes the communication protocol for restricting access by the host computer to the data transmitted through the coprocessor" and that "[s]ecure transaction processing is performed locally in the security coprocessor and non-secure transaction processing is performed in the host computer") actually support the position taken by applicant and clearly do not support the position of the Examiner in attempting to read the claim language on Veil. In the system of Veil, "the sensitive data is never processed by the computer 114 in the traditional computing environment 102 and it is therefore not acceptable to attack" (see column 7, lines 45-49). Thus, claim 1 defines over Veil for at least this reason.

Further, claim 1 recites that the peripheral performs verification operations so as to check that the computer is operating properly. More particularly, as recited in claim 1, the peripheral "receives at least the data input codes" and "computes a code for each elementary operation performed by the processor and verifies proper operation of all or part of the executed program." It is respectfully submitted that such codes differ from, and should not be confused with, cryptographic data. (In this regard, it is clear from the specification that the data processed by the present invention could be transmitted outside of the system in a non-encrypted form.) In any event, the purpose of computing a code for each elementary operation performed by the processor and verifying the operation of all or part of the computer program is not to protect the data against hackers (which is the core purpose of the Veil system) but, instead, to check the properties of the data and to derive therefrom whether the processor is operating correctly.

The parts of the Veil reference that are said to disclose these features have been carefully considered but it is respectfully submitted that the security co-processor of Veil does not compute codes within the meaning of that word as claimed in the claims but rather merely encrypts sensitive data, and, moreover, clearly does not verify the proper operation of the executed program controlling the processor. Further, Veil does not provide for any verification of the nature claimed, much less verification "at least partly

based on the input data codes and the codes computed by the peripheral" as recited in claim 1. Thus, for these additional reasons it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, prior to amendment, patentably defined over Veil.

Applicant has made an earnest effort to place this application in condition for allowance based on the discussions at the interview. Thus, if problems still remain with the allowance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned so that these problems may be addressed.

Allowance of the application in its present form is respectfully solicited.

END REMARKS